**York Central Movement Workshop**

30th July 2018

**In attendance:**

Phil Bixby & Helen Graham My York Central

Professor Tony May Institute for Transport Studies, University of Leeds/ York Civic Trust

Tamsin Hart Jones Homes England/ York Central Partnership Project Manager

Tom Devine National Railway Museum/ York Central Partnership

Tony Clarke City of York Council Transport Planning

Phil White ARUP/ York Central Partnership consultant

Jason Syrett Allies & Morrison/ York Central Partnership consultant

Plus 24 attendees via Eventbrite either representing themselves as residents or representing local groups.

**Context:**

We held two workshops to look at the movement options in the Outline Planning Application. You can read the notes produced from Workshop 1 [here](https://myyorkcentral.org/2018/08/17/movement-york-central-outline-planning-application-workshops/).

An outline planning application is due to be submitted on 8 August 2018 when there will be an opportunity to engage through the local planning authority’s statutory consultation process. The application will be available via the City of York’s planning website <https://planningaccess.york.gov.uk/online-applications/> once the application has been validated (which could take up to two weeks). This will be followed by a full planning application towards the end of September relating to the main access route from Water End to Marble Arch.

Available documents ahead of submission:

* Parameter plans (agenda item 5, annex 4) http://democracy.york.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=733&MId=10469&Ver=4
* Design guide (agenda item 4, annex 2) <http://democracy.york.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=875&MId=10847&Ver=4>

**Workshop 2 Summary**

**Traffic modelling:**

There were a lot of questions the underlying assumptions and impact on bus gate / no bus gate (see Actions below). In essence had potential model shift created by bus gate option been factored in. Should York Central drive the modal shift or respond to it? Why does it have to be a through road? Has the impact of construction traffic been considered? Have commercial business vehicles been incorporated in the assumptions?

**Walking / cycling network:**

A lot of concern was expressed about walking/cycling not being top of the hierarchy in terms of infrastructure; concern over issues from dedicated cycle routes alongside busy road to cycle routes ending and how they reintegrate into roads. There was specific concern about how York Central network links to wider city network (especially Lendal Gyratory etc). Research suggests that greater segregation leads to greater numbers of people choosing to travel by bike. Create a new tunnel for cyclists. Link to Leeman Park would help to connect green spaces and create circuitous routes – masterplan enables this link to come forward in future, but is not part of the current application. However, it was noted that some consultation responses felt that the river route didn’t feel safe.

**Station as focus for walking/cycling routes** and how it copes, plus fragmentation of the three masterplans due to different partners, timescales and funding (there is a link via Arups, CYC and Network Rail). Need to consider fit of the three masterplans together given the predicted 200% increase in passengers at the station. The York Central masterplan does include allowance for station extension, including an extended overbridge. Cambridge was noted as an example of movement possibilities across the railway line/ cross station capacity. There are no plans for ticket barriers at the station.

**NRM and Leeman Road diversion**, with its impact on walking/cycling routes. Specific issues being…

* + Dispute over modelling of times for “alternative” routes around the building (see Actions) including the impact of the diversion on accessibility for elderly, families and people with impairments/ disabilities outside of museum hours.
	+ Concern was raised that alternative routes through the building have been modelled just to show they don’t work. All options were not equally represented at the exhibition (canopy, leave as is with extra security), including cost comparison. Need further engagement with community.
	+ Unwillingness of NRM to accept as baseline full 24/7 access through the building and unwillingness of local groups to accept “opening hours only” as baseline.
	+ Concern over the design brief that will be given to architects if design work progresses, and whether this will preclude 24/7 access
	+ **What will the outline application fix with regard to NRM route?** The parameter plans set a relative route through the museum (precise alignment flexible within the defined area), and note that a pedestrian route may be through the building structure. The parameter plans will also set the volume for the museum expansion. The Design Guide will set the aspirations/ role of the NRM and its buildings. The masterplan will enable a pedestrian connection through the building, but it is not for the masterplan to fix more at this point. The rest of the detail will form part of the reserved matters application. If the outline application is successful then there would be a separate process to stop up the highway.
	+ **Why not take NRM masterplan out of York Central masterplan?** NRM is a landholder of the wider York Central scheme. NRM have an aspiration to reduce parking numbers to less than half of their current provision by creating a shared parking facility with Network Rail. NRM needs to be part of the joined-up story for the wider site. It forms the cultural heart and is a fundamental functional part of the site, including how to move exhibits/ trains through the site to the museum.

**Vehicular access:**

Impact on access by emergency vehicles to St Peters Quarter through one way tunnel. St Peters Quarter would be marooned if bus gate introduced at a later date.

**Parking:**

There is concern that the masterplan focuses on numbers of parking spaces and does not discuss location or the impact this might have on street design / quality. Could staff parking be moved out to Park & Ride?

**Public transport**:

There is concern that York Central is being seen in isolation and no innovative solutions are being considered, nor ways that city-wide improvement could specifically impact York Central (including Park & Ride timing/pricing changes). Bus lanes are difficult to retrofit later, an express route to the city centre should be built from the outset. Buses need to be direct, reliable and prompt to be an attractive alternative. Need bus priority at Water End.

**Inclusivity:**

Need age friendly transport and infrastructure e.g. ramps/ inclines/ seating/ toilets/ adequate crossings. Design guide includes dementia friendly design.

**Place making:**

Need to provide for all groups of user. Streets for movement and as places to enjoy (residential/ play) e.g. Transport for London Healthy Streets initiative.

**Timing of decision making:**

Overall concerns over timing and how/when various issues will “firm up” and need to be addressed via public engagement through outline and detailed planning stages. Funding requires the route to be delivered by 2021. What will York Central mean to York’s future Local Transport Plan (to be reviewed 2019 post Local Plan).

**Actions:**

* **Transport modelling:** Tony May to liaise with YCP regarding looking at the live modelling information after the Transport Assessment is available and examining what impact some changed assumptions might bring. The main questionable assumptions being:-
	+ What impact would improved public transport have
	+ What impact would improved walking/cycling infrastructure have
	+ What impact would simple closure of route(s) have in respect of traffic load which doesn’t get displaced
	+ Does the model take into account clear current trends in respect of moving away from car use (especially young people)
	+ Could we reverse the approach to decide what situation we wanted on York Central and then model what improvements to the overall network (including public transport / walking / cycling) would be needed to make it work?
	+ What are the proportion of bus rates out of the total trips?
	+ Look at how Design Guide sets principles for movement/ place.
* **Pedestrian and cycling routes diversion times around NRM:** Proposed meeting between Arup and York Cycle Campaign to examine this.

**MYC post meeting recommendations:**

* **Roadmap for involvement:** Need a roadmap forwards showing what will be decided when and allowing design of a public process which allows full engagement rather than simply commenting / objecting.
* **How to move towards co-design:** Masterplanners receive feedback, they go away and develop designs, then show them as glossy illustrations. In the next phase, how can people be more involved in the creative process..
* **Role of York Central Community Forum:** YCCF role/structure going forward is uncertain – but if made an open forum could be a place for ongoing involvement.

Further questions invited to myyorkcentral@gmail.com